

Risø High Dose Reference Laboratory

Note on NPL comparison 2016, verification of calibration, electrons Alanine dosimeter batch AX600

Procedure: HDRL-P-18: Comparison program – external:

Irradiation of NPL dosimeters and Risø HDRL dosimeters at a 10 MeV electron accelerator (HDRL-I-48).

Irradiation at Sterigenics, Espergærde 2016.07.26.

NPL alanine reference dosimeters: Batch 72, 1067-1072, in holder type E (standard holder).

HDRL dosimeters: Harwell alanine pellets, batch AX600, 1308-1313, in standard holder. Kodak alanine film, batch 312 set 12, six sets of three films.

Geometry: Risø HDRL standard absorber for irradiation of dosimeters at electron accelerators. Absorbers were placed in aluminum trays for irradiation at conveyor. Calorimeters used solely to measure start and end temperatures of irradiations.

Phantom	NPL	HDRL	HDRL films	Req. dose	Temp.	Temp.
	dosim.	pellets			(start)	(end)
#	71	AX600	312-12	[kGy]	[°C]	[°C]
10A	1067	1308	4083,3627,3475	10	20.8	28.7
10B	1068	1309	3522,3643,3623	10	20.8	28.7
20A	1069	1310	3516,3491,3994	20	21.3	36.6
20B	1070	1311	3993,3907,3911	20	21.6	36.7
40A	1071	1312	4018,3397,3898	40	21.4	51.0
40B	1072	1313	4103,3507,3616	40	21.4	51.0

Irradiation data:



2016.08.23

Page 2 of 5

Measurements:

Pellets, AX600:

1	Measured:	2016.08.12
	Instrument:	Bruker e-scan
2	Measured:	2016.08.19
	Instrument:	Bruker EMX

Results from pellets measured on e-scan were reported to NPL in certificate 16C-71 (2016.08.15).

Kodak alanine films, 312-12:

1	Measured:	2016.08.19	
	Instrument:	Bruker EMS-104	

Results:

Results contained in NPL certificate for alanine dosimeter measurements 2016060482/1 received 2016.09.16.

1 Pellets measured on e-scan (blind comparison)

Uncertainty associated with NPL transfer dosimeter readings: U(NPL) = 2.6% (k=2)

Uncertainty associated with HDRL dosimeter readings (e-scan). Excluding NPL transfer dosimeter uncertainty:

U(HDRL) = 1.88% (k=2).

2016.08.23



Page 3 of 5

Phantom	NPL Dose	HDRL dose (e-scan)	%Difference	E-value
#	[kGy]	[kGy]	[%]	k=2
10A	9.97	10.21	2.4	0.74
10B	10.01	10.18	1.7	0.53
20A	20.0	20.3	1.5	0.47
20B	20.1	20.4	1.5	0.46
40A	40.5	41.1	1.5	0.47
40B	40.0	40.5	1.3	0.41
		Average	1.7	0.5

2 Pellets measured on EMX (blind comparison)

Uncertainty associated with HDRL dosimeter readings (EMX). Excluding NPL transfer dosimeter uncertainty:

U(HDRL) = 1.81% (k=2).

Phantom	NPL Dose	HDRL dose (EMX)	%Difference	E-value
#	[kGy]	[kGy]	[%]	k=2
10A	9.97	10.18	2.1	0.66
10B	10.01	10.25	2.4	0.75
20A	20.0	20.1	0.4	0.13
20B	20.1	20.2	0.7	0.22
40A	40.5	40.6	0.3	0.11
40B	40.0	40.4	1.0	0.31
		Average	0.1	0.36

Comments:

All E-values (both instruments) are less than 1, and the result of the comparison is acceptable. However we note that all measured doses at HDRL are numerically greater than those from NPL for the same irradiation geometry, and this will be investigated further.



Page 4 of 5

3 Alanine films measured on EMS-104 (blind comparison)

Uncertainty associated with HDRL dosimeter readings (e-scan). Excluding NPL transfer dosimeter uncertainty:

U(HDRL) = 1.97% (k=2).

Dosimeters measured using both average irradiation temperature and maximum irradiation temperature.

Phantom	NPL Dose	HDRL dose (EMS-	%Difference	E-value
		104), mean temp		
#	[kGy]	[kGy]	[%]	k=2
10A	9.97	10.13	1.6	0.49
10B	10.01	10.09	0.8	0.24
20A	20.0	20.4	2.2	0.67
20B	20.1	20.0	-0.4	0.14
40A	40.5	41.8	3.2	0.99
40B	40.0	41.8	4.5	1.36
		Average	2.0	0.65

1: Correction to response using average temperature

2: Correction to response using maximum temperature

Phantom	NPL Dose	HDRL dose (EMS-	%Difference	E-value
		104), max temp		
#	[kGy]	[kGy]	[%]	k=2
10A	9.97	10.07	1.0	0.30
10B	10.01	10.04	0.3	0.09
20A	20.0	20.2	1.0	0.31
20B	20.1	19.8	-1.6	0.49
40A	40.5	40.7	0.4	0.14
40B	40.0	40.7	1.6	0.50
		Average	0.5	0.30



2016.08.23

Comments:

1: It is clear that the results from film measurements are much improved if like the pellets, they are measured with a correction to the maximum irradiation temperature. This will be implemented immediately. However very few high-energy irradiations use the dosimeter films, and the change is within the expected overall uncertainty, so there are no issues regarding incorrect dose.

2: With the maximum irradiation temperature, the E-values are all significantly less than 1.0, so the comparison is acceptable.

Mark Bailey Arne Miller 24 August 2016